

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 137 305

SP 010 958

AUTHOR Maddox, Kathryn; Mahan, James
TITLE National ATE Commission for Consortium Study and Development. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Association of Teacher Educators, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Feb 77
NOTE 46p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Consortia; *Cooperative Planning; Cooperative Programs; *Dual Enrollment; *Educational Coordination; Intercollegiate Programs; *Interinstitutional Cooperation; Interschool Communication; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

This report by the Commission for Consortium Study and Development is divided into three sections. In section one consortia are defined; the perimeters and benefits to be derived from such cooperation are discussed; and the organization and implementation of consortia are outlined. Section two described student teaching exchange programs. The third section presents models of teacher education consortia. (JD)

* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

ED137305

NATIONAL ATE

Commission for Consortium Study and Development

Final Report

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

**Submitted to
Executive Committee
February 1977**

by Kathryn Maddox and James Mahan

SP 010 958

National ATE
Commission for Consortium Study and Development

Final Report

Section I Consortia

- A. Definition, perimeters and Benefits of Consortia
 by L. O. Andrews
- B. Organization and Implementation of Consortia
 by Donald E. Orlosky

Section II Student Teaching Exchange Programs
 summary by James Mahan

Section III Teacher Education Consortium Models
 summary by Kathryn Maddox

**National ATE
Commission for Consortium Study and Development**

Final Report

The National Association of Teacher Educators (ATE) established a Commission for Consortium Study and Development in February 1975. Serving as Co-chairpersons for this Commission are Kathryn Maddox, Director, Kanawha Valley Multi-Institutional Teacher Education Center (MITEC), Charleston, West Virginia and James Mahan, Coordinator of Alternative Programs Development, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana. A list of the members of the Commission is attached.

The Commission is submitting a brochure of "Consortia" to the Executive Committee for consideration for publishing and dissemination by ATE. If approved, Kanawha Valley MITEC has agreed to print and mail the brochure to ATE members.

The Final Report is enclosed.

Section I

A: by L. O. Andrews
The Ohio State University
For Sub-Committee Three
July 15, 1975

Definition, perimeters and benefits to be derived from Teacher Education Consortia.

1. Consortium Study and Development: From a careful study of the events and materials listed above several generalizations may be attempted.
 - a. The word "consortium" essentially refers to the efforts of a group of institutions with some real or assumed common goals to band together formally or informally to achieve these goals.
 - b. The literature (including reports of various studies) of consortia in higher education is rather extensive, but usually refers only to one genre of institutions - colleges and universities.
 - c. The literature (and unfortunately the studies) of consortia in TE which includes various types of institutions - colleges, school systems, professional organizations, state departments, et cetera - is very scanty. Cooperative arrangements in TE have confused terminology, varied objectives, governance ranging from personal cooperation to incorporated, highly organized structures, and an extremely varied track record of successful accomplishment. The word "consortium" is really not broad enough to cover the wide range of cooperative arrangements used in TE.
 - d. Philosophically and generically, consortia are organizations of autonomous bodies (or individuals, as in marriage) which band together by some relatively formal agreement to secure some benefits. But in so doing the organization assumes some new prerogatives as a basis for service to its members; and its members, in turn, give up some rights, privileges, or whatever, as stipulated in the agreement.
 - e. The U.S.A. is relatively unique in its need for consortia in TE, since most countries in the world have national or state ministries of education which have control over both the schools and the teacher preparing institutions - thus a unified system.
 - f. In the U.S.A. beginning in the middle of the last century in the single purpose teacher preparing institutions (the Normal Schools, later becoming Teachers Colleges) a unique institution emerged - the campus, laboratory, model or practice school. Later many universities and some private colleges

developed such schools as a laboratory for TE students. These schools were college controlled schools. This fact led to a point of view which shows up clearly in list of principles for directed teaching written by Raleigh Schorling in the 34th Yearbook (1935) of the National Society of College Teachers of Education, as follows:

"Principle 11. An institution should not give credit for directing teaching unless that institution exercises control over the directed teaching situation."

Not only would this principle not be written today, it would not be permitted by either school systems or teachers organizations. It is interesting to note that the basic ideas in all the other 13 principles could be accepted by most teacher educators today.

- g. With the sudden doubling of S-T enrollments in 1948-52, due to the "veteran bulge", placements shifted to off-campus, chiefly public schools, and placements in laboratory schools declined until few are made today.
- h. Historically until the late 1950's consortia in TE have been chiefly of three types;
 - (1) Formal contracts between colleges and individual school systems, chiefly to set conditions for use of the schools as S-Ting laboratories. In the first half of the century these agreements were usually for private colleges and those universities without, or with small campus schools.
 - (2) Formal contracts between colleges and individual school systems to govern the operation of off-campus (sometimes on-campus) laboratory schools, wherein the colleges received some control (usually with limitations) over the schools, such as, use as a laboratory, the selection of staff, the development of curriculum, the budget, and sometimes for on-campus schools the selection of pupils.
 - (3) Teacher Education Councils, usually extra-legal, policy recommending agencies, chiefly in southern states as a result of the efforts of the Teacher Education Commission (1938-1943), and other less formal organizations of teacher preparing institutions.
- 1. Since the late 1950's a series of waves of concern have emerged in attempts to find some solutions to this double-headed problem: the development of quality TE laboratories in the public schools, and governance structures to facilitate the joint effort of two disparate types of institutions. Fundamentally the problem has been to find a solution to the dilemma of trying to operate a professional curriculum of one institution - the college - in another institution as the laboratory - the public schools, and more recently the private schools as well.

In summary, the tragic fact is that serious study of the ways to organize disparate institutions into consortia to provide TE laboratories has waited from 1950 until now. In the meantime, a few small flurries of effort occurred in scattered places, but no extensive, serious national effort to develop the models and resources necessary for this very important task. A review of the literature reveals little more than some surveys, some descriptions of structures and the operation of unusual situations together with a few projections of new approaches.

1.1 Surveys, Studies and Major Reports: Since the publication of the Flowers Report in 1948, few in-depth studies and reports have appeared in this area of collaboration in TE. Many minor publications, committee and conference reports, individual institutional plans and reports of patterns of cooperation have been issued; but since the number of institutions is so large and the variety of situations so great, these efforts have usually been like little ripples in a very large body of water. Briefly listed the following seem to be of special concern to the Commission:

- a. School-College Relationships in Teacher Education: Report of a National Survey of Cooperative Ventures. AACTE, 1964
- b. Cooperative Structures in School-College Relationships for Teacher Education. AACTE, 1965
- c. Cooperation in Student Teaching. Educational Research Service Circular, AASA, NEA, May 1964
- d. Who's in Charge Here? NCTEPS, NEA, 1966
- e. A New Order in Student Teaching: Fixing Responsibility for Student Teaching. NCTEPS, NEA, 1967
- f. Johnson, James A., A National Survey of Student Teaching Programs. M-STEP, 1968
- g. Obligation for Reform: The Final Report of the Higher Education Task Force on Improvement and Reform in American Education. AACTE, January 1974
- h. "Thematic Section of Teacher/Teaching Centers", Journal of Teacher Education, Spring 1974
- i. Schmieder, Allen A. and Sam J. Yargar, Teaching Centers: Toward the State of the Scene. AACTE, November 1974
- j. Teacher Centers in Japan, England and the United States by M. Vue DeVault, University of Wisconsin and LTI of U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C., 1973
- k. In West Virginia, It is Working: The Teacher Education Center in Action by Kathryn Maddox (Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1973)

1. Governance by Consortium - Syracuse University and National Consortium of Competency-Based Education Centers, 1974

Of the above, a and b have the most detail on types of arrangements and actual details on the structures themselves. b and e have several statements and diagrams of suggested models and state arrangements. c and f have data on S-Ting but very little on the arrangements for cooperative effort. The essential problem is analyzed in d. h and i do not differentiate between types of structures for TE in terms of function except as examples are given. The most useful material for the Commission may actually be in a and b, though these are the oldest of the group listed. But, in any event, this group of publications probably give more background for the work of the Commission than other publications, except for the papers listed earlier.

2. Perimeters for the Work of the Commission: The Commission members themselves are engaged in a rather wide variety of types of cooperative efforts, which most of the members would consider very important and worthwhile. However, it is very clear that a definition of consortia would have to be very broad to encompass all these and their related efforts. At the same time a very strict and narrow definition would not be helpful to many teacher educators looking for enlightenment and guidance in conducting their cooperative ventures. Rather than propose exactly the types of structures or functions that should be included in the work of the Commission it appears wiser in this report to attempt a rather broad, but rough classification of types of arrangements with some examples of each type. The Commission then could select those types for study on the basis of which would be most helpful to workers in the field.

Suggested Types of Collaborative Effort in TE in the U.S.A.

a. Institutional policy of cooperative effort with many other institutions:

University of Northern Colorado, Placement of S-Ts in many states and foreign countries, and service for guest S-Ts from other institutions.

Indiana University program for cross-cultural S-T placement in Mexican-American and Native-American communities.

b. Institutional program designed to serve as a vehicle to arrange special S-Ting experiences for students from other institutions:

University of Alabama program of S-Ting abroad, especially in Latin America open to students from other institutions.

Cooperative Urban Teacher Education (CUTE program in Kansas City originally under the Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory), which provided an urban S-Ting experience for students usually from small private colleges.

- c. TE Councils as chiefly advisory and coordinating bodies with informal governance structures and no council staff as such:

Troy State University (Alabama) Teacher Education Council, multi-institutional with several school systems.

Marion County (Indianapolis, Indiana) TE Council, multi-institutional with several colleges and many school systems.

Under this type the arrangements vary greatly, ranging from advisory or feedback mechanisms to formal structures, but with no budget, staff or administrative and decision making control over policies.

- d. TE Councils with formal governance structures: Many variations of the two examples can be found throughout the country.

Central Minnesota TE Council (St. Cloud State College), single institution working with many school systems, the Council has formally incorporated as a non-profit corporation with a constitution, dues, budget to spend, and administrative and decision making power over program and policies.

An Agreement of Cooperation between the Metropolitan Board of Education and Local Colleges and Universities (Nashville, Tennessee). A council for one school system and eight colleges, professional organizations and the state department, which depends on staff service donated by the school system, but working under Council approved policies.

- e. Agreements between a college and a public school system to purchase from the schools complete S-Ting service, but sometimes also complete professional instructional service for courses and experiences for extended periods of time:

The City of Los Angeles provided placement and supervision for S-Ts through its own staff for local colleges since the mid-1930's.

Some small colleges in New England and Washington state made arrangements to turn their students over to specific schools to provide all their professional instruction and experiences for given college terms.

- f. Consortia of institutions chiefly for the cooperative operation of curriculum elements and for long-range curricular improvement in TE:

Wisconsin Improvement Program consists of 16 higher education institutions with advisory committees from the schools, which operate a state-wide internship program, and is projecting movement into a post-degree, post-certification residency program.

- g. Student Teaching or Teacher Education Centers consisting of a small number of continuous schools into which, usually only one college, would place a fairly high concentration of S-Ts. Such centers should be designated as instructional or learning centers, and are the commonest type of TE arrangement designated by the name "Center". Their types may vary in many ways, and probably several dozen different patterns could be designated. A few samples:

University of Maryland models as presented in the ATE National Clinic in 1971, and University of Maryland-Baltimore County, more recently, models in which a resident coordinator is jointly selected and paid with funds supplied by both institutions.

Towson State College type, in which the resident coordinator is a full college employee, but is assigned to a particular center. This appears to be the commonest model judging by data found through a doctoral study done at Ohio State University.

- h. Teacher Education Centers with a formal governance structure, budget and staff usually serving several colleges and several school systems. These are facilitating, coordinating centers of an over-arching umbrella type in contrast to the learning centers described in g above.

West Virginia with a 1963 enabling act has established the first state-wide network of such centers. They have three-part financing - state, college and school - administrative, coordinating and facilitating staff service for a wide range of functions for local schools and colleges.

Texas and Florida have state mandates to establish a system of TE Centers with similar purposes, which are in various stages of indigenous development.

One might hazard a guess that the five types for which analysis and guidelines would be the most useful to institutions across the country would be types a, b, d, g and h. But looking ahead to the long future f probably should also be studied. An early decision on this point must be made by the Commission in order to expedite its work.

3. Benefits to be derived from Consortia: At this point it would be premature to any more than sketch very briefly the areas of benefits which might accrue to these different potential members of consortia. To be very useful these areas of benefits should be carefully identified and possibly allocated to particular types of consortia.

- a. To School Systems: Probably this area has been more poorly developed than any other. Over the years school administrators, school boards, and negotiated contracts have set up restrictions on the assumption that any great concentration of prospective teachers in a given school situation would be harmful to the

best interest of pupils. Yet research and experience both amply demonstrate that good TE programs in schools can assist in producing a better learning situation than schools are likely to produce alone. Also there is evidence to suggest that comprehensive programs provided by Teacher Education Centers encourage and support innovative activities in school systems.

Unfortunately the corollary is also true that administrators of colleges and school systems and most Education faculty members do not realize what it costs in organization, and human and material resources to produce and maintain an excellent teacher education laboratory.

Several of these types of consortia have demonstrated that a single agency can facilitate and expedite preservice TE from the earliest contact by prospective teachers, but also do the same for inservice TE and continuing education to provide for teacher growth from beginning teacher status until preparation for retirement.

Many now suggest that inservice and continuing TE are the wave of the future, and that most universities will likely put more resources into inservice than preservice by 1985. However, it is clear that teachers and teachers organizations are demanding much more field-based, problem-centered inservice courses and less campus-type, theoretical courses. A comprehensive Teacher Education Center can be very effective in identifying needs, coordinating efforts and expediting delivery of such types of experiences.

To divorce school systems from higher education institutions altogether would run the risk of isolating practitioners from the major source of much of the research, program development and theoretical knowledge as it is produced. Certainly the cultural lag between the development of a new idea or technique and the time of its use by teachers generally is catastrophically long now, sometimes spoken of as a generation. Collaboration ought to, and has been demonstrated to shorten this gap.

- b. To Colleges and Universities: To any college person who has been involved or witnessed the result of a school system declining to continue a TE laboratory contract, the dependence of the colleges upon school systems becomes an absolute need. Leaders have preached collaboration very generally since about 1950, but college personnel have seldom acted as if they believed that they could lose their laboratories. More recently as teachers organizations have negotiated contracts including TE clauses the critical nature of firm, working agreements has become much clearer to many. In the next few years some colleges may very well drop their TE curricula altogether because of their failure to maintain working relations with local schools. Talk of collaboration, parity and representation for all groups will not be enough. Functioning, effective

structural arrangements will become a necessity in many places, where they have not previously been seen in this light. In New York state consortia arrangements have been mandated by the Board of Regents for the colleges to develop and use in preparing their plans for implementing mandated CBTE programs.

Colleges and universities have been increasingly using many kinds of informal plans for getting field input into curriculum planning for the professional sequence. Teachers organizations are more and more demanding a voice in such decisions. Proper consortia arrangements would make this type of flow easier and a perfectly normal expectation.

Frequently one notes words of caution, that while consortia are often organized on the assumption that some kind of financial savings can accrue, this expectation seems not often realized. Still, colleges of education as well as schools are under real budget crunches which are not expected to be alleviated in the near future. One way to reduce costs is to drop marginal programs of high cost, and share facilities. Fewer colleges should offer some of the specialized programs in a given state. Also money for developmental grants and evaluation projects for pilot programs is much less available than recently. But because of the reduced demand for large numbers of new personnel, now is the time to push for developing higher quality programs.

To the casual observer every institution should not expect to "reinvent the wheel" by developing all aspects of a given new program within its own institution. If colleges could reach the point of believing in the desirability of "sharing", probably much better programs could be developed and much more intensive evaluation made of the results of pilot programs. For example, in a consortium of eight institutions developing a proposed new program with eight major components, each college could put its best resources into developing the model for one component, trying it out, evaluating it in depth, and finally sharing all the results with the other eight colleges. Surely the developmental costs would be greatly reduced and the level of confidence in the worth of the new elements greatly increased.

- c. To the State, as an Agency, or to the People, as the Body Politic: In this country the constitution has delegated to the states the responsibility for education, and now all states officially assume the responsibility for certification. Then in view of the fact that teaching is a public profession, the quality of performance of practitioners is certainly a direct concern of the state, since state departments usually assume some responsibility for monitoring quality of the schools. On these bases it can be very logically argued that the stake of the state (all the people through their state government) is very real in TE. If then it can be demonstrated that quality of TE can be enhanced by collaboration of institutions,

then the state might well see that policies for operating collaborative structures be set up, and that some of the cost and some coordination be provided by the state, as is actually done in West Virginia.

- d. To the Community: Probably teacher educators are not accustomed to think in these terms, but rather just in relation to good education for pupils in the schools. In these days of pressure for accountability, there may be increasing pressure to demonstrate that through consortia more effective use may be made of resources and that the quality of the preservice and inservice experiences in TE may be enhanced. As a result public representatives on governance boards may press for more effective collaboration through consortia.

4. The Rationale and Research Basis for the Development of Consortia in TE: Clearly this step must follow several other stages in the work of the Commission. However, the importance of these two phases must not be underestimated. The theory base under much of what has been done in TE for the last hundred years has been very thin indeed. There are many concepts in the related social and behavioral sciences which could be used to support much of our best thinking in developing collaborative relationships. Unfortunately, most teacher educators are not good enough scholars in these fields to identify and use many of these concepts. A thorough exploration in this area is more than most Commissions, without extensive budgets, could ever undertake.

The strength of this Commission is that it includes a goodly number of very able and experienced people in the areas of concern. Therefore, probably the best that can be hoped for is that some carefully developed rationales may emerge together with suggested guidelines as an aid to workers in the field. The next and really the most critical stage is to design research techniques that can gather data on feasibility, efficiency, satisfaction on the part of all types of participants, and hopefully some evidence on effectiveness. The ultimate goal would be to get some indication of the influence consortia can have on the people they serve and their success as practitioners in the schools. These are difficult tasks, and the Commission is not likely to engage in that kind of research as a Commission. Rather its greatest service may be to lay some carefully developed guidelines upon which research efforts may be designed.

Section I

B: By Donald Orlosky
University of South Florida
Tampa, Florida

Organization and Implementation of Consortia

Initiation of Cooperative Relationships Organization

A consortium is not merely an arrangement for institutions to organize and cooperate. Prior considerations, characteristics of the institutions, and a procedure for identifying appropriate institutions are vital elements in determining success for cooperation. These factors emerge as important elements when those who have studied consortia of Institutes of Higher Education report their findings. *Consider the following statements in respect to these early steps:

The first problem is institutional self-appraisal. As someone has inferred, this is pre-organizational. Exactly what do we want to achieve? Herein are we incomplete with need for rounding out? If we want to communicate, do we really have anything to say? If we want to cooperate, what are we prepared to give and to receive? Is there any genuine mutuality of interest among proposed cooperators? What do we have which is really distinctive, or could be made so by cooperation? In any case, before cooperators are rounded up, the first task is critical institutional analysis. This is a matter of discovery - self-discovery. (8:80-81)

It is not known whether a promising project for one group of colleges will turn out to be as advantageous for another group. Such variables as campus leadership, quality of coordination, particular needs of member institutions, the geographical spread of membership, and the history of successes and failures of the cooperating groups concerned will have much to say as to which of several potential projects tend to be most promising. (22:243)

Assuming that both the quantitative and qualitative growth of consortia will continue, it becomes incumbent upon persons working with these organizations to recognize that some problems and limitations are common to all cooperative organizations. Unless this is the case, institutional personnel who found consortia can hardly begin to deal with these organizations in either an appropriate or a sophisticated fashion. Realizing that two or three years may pass before major projects leave ground zero requires sophisticated patience, and watching the downfall of pet project ideas demands unusual flexibility if a phoenix is to rise from the ashes. The very low mortality rate of formally-organized consortia provides strong evidence that these organizations succeed more often than not. Thus, these traits are

* Throughout this report the analysis is based on the experience of IHE's. In many cases, consortia will include relationship between IHE's and LEA's (Local Education Agencies) or among several LEA's.

generally present. At the same time, however, research on consortium formation has shown that problems such as geographic separation, equipment incompatibility, intracollege communications failures, or just plain apathy emerge as more significant obstacles than is admitted when such organizations are created. (5:750)

In a survey conducted by the author, more than 80 percent of the consortia reporting were found to have been formed without having developed concise plans for administering the programs they eventually undertook. This percentage might easily have been higher were it not for the incentives provided through funding sources that required the preparation of well-developed, concrete program designs before a grant was awarded. Thus, an early "search for identity" is quite common among new consortia. (5:755)

The potential to magnify the utilization of personnel and programs through consortia was emphasized by Johnson who said:

Professors in a particular discipline can gain from participation in a community of like-minded scholars enlarged enough to be exceedingly stimulating but not enough to be self-defeating. In other words, one of the potentialities is the capacity to develop the required "critical mass" for professional stimulation, for attacking common problems, and for operating complex and costly programs. This is a new way of extending institutional responsibility and action to new areas without threatening institutional integrity. (9:344)

The essential factors to take into account in getting a consortium underway include (1) careful selection of schools that will become members of the consortium (i.e., common problems, common interests, geographical proximity, eagerness to participate); (2) a purpose in coming together that binds the schools philosophically; (3) and sufficient flexibility in the planning stages to permit individuality of the participants.

PURPOSES AND OBJECTIVES

Some consortia have been developed for specific purposes but most consortia have been formed to cooperate with each other on a wide scale. There is no evidence to suggest that one or the other is a more effective strategy. Consortia that cut across total operations must often settle on specific programs and areas of cooperation that focus on the needs of a given program, however. Any institution that participates in a consortium might also be a member of other consortia and already be the beneficiary of cooperation in budgeting, purchasing, accounting, fringe benefits, and so forth.

The programs that have arisen from consortia quite often involve cost-effectiveness, broadening of student opportunities, improvement of communication, and coordination of expertise and facilities. A few examples illustrate these gains:

The Interuniversity Communications Council (called EDUCOM) was formed as a nonprofit corporation in 1964 by six universities interested in the furtherance of biomedical communications through the application of modern technology. Now the Council membership is close to 100 institutions of higher education with some 250 campuses, and all aspects of education are within the flexible boundaries of EDUCOM activities. (12:1071)

They give the university faculty member an opportunity to top off or round out highly specialized library collections and laboratories to have overseas research platforms for launching projects related to foreign cultures, and to break out of the confines of his own box, however commodious it may be, with his own seed money to experiment with like-minded colleagues in the cooperating universities. There can be no doubt that extension of opportunity, the provision of new dimensions for both faculty and students, is one of the most appealing of the cooperative potentialities. (9:344)

The geographical spread of a consortium's membership, and the interest and inclinations of faculty and staff of member institutions will have much to do with which projects might be undertaken and whether, in turn, significant savings might be achieved. The experience of consortia suggests that savings are possible in some of the following areas.

1. Business travel insurance, provided to all institutional employees, can be jointly purchased at savings up to 25 percent over identical plans individually purchased. Personal accident insurance handled through payroll deductions and purchased through a consortium can provide savings of five percent as compared with other group plans.
2. Medical expense coverage, life insurance and disability insurance, with a measure of institutional choice allowed, can be jointly purchased at a savings.
3. In the academic area, the emergence of the January inter-term has offered consortia a new opportunity to gather sufficient student enrollments to make advantageous learning experiences economically feasible. While student exchanges for semester or term enrollments have been available, only in a limited number of consortia and subject fields has significant activity been noted. Geographical proximity of institutions has been a consideration, particularly when students avail themselves of courses at several institutions in the same semester.
4. Purchases of utility-type services such as a telephone conferencing system and computer time-sharing and other computer-related services such as programming and systems development have proved advantageous.
5. Joint efforts in student recruitment and public relations seem to offer some potential. Microfilm banks and other means of sharing library periodical resources can show significant savings.
6. With growing emphasis on field experience as a part of a college instructional program, off-campus centers and instructional supervision can be obtained more economically through collective arrangements. (22:248-249)

A university press was created by nine campuses in Kentucky and the director of the University Press of Kentucky stated that:

Of all the things that have happened to me in a quarter of a century of publishing, the nine-campus Kentucky consortium for scholarly publishing is the most satisfying. The reason is that so many voices had been raised in doubt that cooperation among Kentucky's education institutions was impossible on any level - and many more had felt that the consequence of cooperation, if it did work, would be endless bickering and watering down of the quality of our books. It is therefore both a surprise and a delight to be able to report that cooperation could not be smoother or more effective or more pleasant, and that all the other campuses are as interested as our own in maintaining and building the quality of our list. (6:21)

The Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education (KRCHE), made up of 18 colleges, is providing an effective academic and administrative service with its KRCHE communications network.

1. The American Film Institute initiated the services of the KRCHE network by monitoring a conference call arrangement about a recent film shown among the consortium members. The director of the film was put on the conference circuit for an intercampus critique.
2. A black studies program was conducted on a conference call by a leading professor from a black campus.
3. Two campuses which have unequal laboratory facilities share the special feature of each in a series of telelectures and conference arrangements, a practice which completely eliminates the necessity of transporting students from one campus to the other. (18:22)

It is obvious that consortia have devised numerous ways to capitalize on their alignments. The advantages in the general area of fringe benefits are not the chief concerns in this document. However, the examples of fringe benefits and other cooperative endeavors suggest the advantages consortia have found in their alliances. The advantages should be equally beneficial in improving teacher education programs if consortia are adequately planned to insure a solid foundation and sufficiently flexible to permit the talents of the members of the consortia to generate the improvements in teacher education that one institution alone is not likely to develop.

ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

The administrative structure typically includes a central coordinating responsibility and an advisory board to determine the programs that should be supported. A large cumbersome and expensive central administration is not necessary according to the experience of existing consortia. In fact, an extensive bureaucratic structure would violate one of the main advantages of a consortium. A consortium should free the participating members to innovate and experiment with a minimum of restriction (subject to the approval of the advisory board). The central administration of the consortia is established to offer services to the member institutions rather than to direct and control their activities.

Experiences of consortia with administrative and organizational procedures verify the recommendation that the administrative organization remain as basic and simple as possible without jeopardizing the functioning of the consortium. A few statements from those who have analyzed the organizational arrangements of consortia describe the manner in which the central coordinating function of a consortium can be met. One association of colleges stressed the importance of having an administrative organization through which cooperation was achieved (9:342). In another cooperative a central office with a fact-finding agency of only two professionals serves a role of liaison with the members of the cooperative (19:357). Another spokesman urged that the function of the central nerve center of the association of colleges should include the establishment of loyalty and a sense of belonging for a common cause (8:84). In no instance did anyone recommend that the central coordinating arrangement should dominate the institutions in a consortium to the extent that it controlled the behavior of the colleges who hold membership in the consortium. The organizational structure must offer a central clearing house to handle correspondence, provide for meetings, plan agendas, establish meeting dates and locations, maintain

files on proceedings, submit report to all members, manage discussions made by the representatives of each institution, and attend to the numerous details associated with data collection, surveys, needs assessments, development of publications, and exchange of ideas and problems. However, a minimum layer of organizational structure should be developed to manage the consortium.

BUDGET AND FINANCE

"A consortia has three considerations in the area of fiscal management. These three components entail (1) the costs of developing and maintaining a consortium; (2) a consortium's capacity to contribute to the educational administrative opportunities of its members; and (3) a consortium's capacity to save or make money for its members." (1:252-253)

The first two of these three factors must be present if a consortium is to succeed. The basic machinery to maintain a consortium is an obvious given, otherwise the consortium will cease to exist; and the second of these two factors is essential if the members of the consortium are to find their membership worthwhile. The third is often the basis on which institutions may regard a consortium to be attractive but is the least dependable. Inter-institutional cooperative enterprises have demonstrated their capacity to add significantly to their member institution's environments. The consortia arrangement, however, has not yet proved its ability to relieve members of their immediate cash squeeze, and institutions about to enter - or already in - consortia should be realistic about their expectations. (1:252)

There are instances of consortia saving and making money for its members, and these saving features are important, but an institution that expects to find a major source of revenue through the consortia approach is likely to be disappointed. The experience of existing consortia on fiscal matters is not uniform, but some rather clear principles emerge from the total view of consortia efforts and the changing times over the last fifteen years. A look at some of these experiences should prove useful.

One question always asked by college representatives contemplating membership in a consortium is, "What will it cost us?" The answer varies with the vision and objectives of the members. Dues generally range from \$5,000 to \$10,000 per year per member. This provides a minimum budget for staff and a modest amount of program activities. Additional amounts are usually contributed for specific program commitments. However, it should be stressed that certain economics can be realized through the association concept. (13:38-39)

Obviously questions such as who should pay, for what, how much and for what period of time must be answered. In some instances, a consortium office has been financed initially, in whole or in part, by a foundation. Such support probably will be temporary, although "temporary" can be for several years. Ultimately the participating institutions will have to face alternatives. (20:74)

It costs money to cooperate. Too often, one encounters unrealistic expectations. Some optimistically believe that if activities are pooled, not only will the increased volume reduce costs but there will be little or no expense for the coordination required. However, coordination has two kinds of expenses: those associated with the central coordination that puts the individual campus parts together into a single functioning operation, and those on the participating campuses that interface with the coordinated effort. The campus costs involve meetings among participating institutions to set policies as well as for on-campus functions and routine processing activities.

Beyond the core budget, a special projects category can be used to reflect the ups and downs of annual funding, shifts in program emphasis or new directions. Moving away from a hand-to-mouth annual "go-no-go" on the entire cooperative effort is essential to the maturation of a consortium. The consortium that fails to achieve at least a minimal core maintenance level will probably not survive, and the early years of effort invested in developing that consortium will be lost. (22:244-247)

Some consortia have been successful in the past in obtaining funds which a consortium could put to work more effectively than any single institution might. In an unusual example the CIC made small seed grants to a group of professors to cover basic transportation costs to meet and plan interinstitutional cooperation. The first seed grant of \$1,000 was followed by two more seed grants of \$1,000 to \$2,000 each. As a consequence of the meetings a proposal was developed to the United States Public Health Service that resulted in an initial grant of \$238,016 and another grant of \$794,724 - a return of \$258 for each \$1 invested.

The permanent financial support for consortia must eventually come from the members of the consortium itself. An external source may succeed in starting a consortium but commitment from each institution should include a contribution of time and resources to maintain the organization. Funding from

outside sources should always be a part of the agenda as each year's program is reviewed, but the consortium should not enter any year - depending on doubtful external financial support to continue its operation. Financial support may need to come for institutional assessments or from other forms of institutional commitment.

EVALUATION AND PLANNING

Decisions to continue or discontinue programs within a consortium or the consortium itself have to do with evaluation of those programs under the auspices of the consortium. Quite apart from fiscal circumstances which may dictate decisions about programs, the question remains as to whether a given program has served its purpose well enough to be continued and what has been learned in the management of a program that might be useful in other programs. Evaluation of programs is also central to decisions about plans for future efforts. If we look first at questions on the effectiveness of the consortium, what are the questions to be answered? The following questions are the questions to be asked by donors or the members of a consortium to determine if the organization should be continued or abandoned after a reasonable trial effort.

1. What kind of leadership has the consortium attracted?
2. Who are the institutional representatives to the consortium?
3. Is there a discernible sense of community?
4. Does news and descriptions of consortium activities get into alumni news, reports to trustees, catalogs, presidential speeches, and are faculty and students aware of the consortium?
5. Is member representation dependable and constant?
6. Is attendance at meetings good?
7. Is the governance appropriate and effective?
8. Does it have an arbitration mechanism?
9. Does it have a well-established communication system?
10. In what concrete ways would it be missed by its members if it terminated?

If a consortium can justify its existence and continuation, then questions about evaluation focus on the programs or projects that might

be started and continued within the organization. The best approach on this question is to insist that the board of directors of the consortium authorize only those projects that can specify the purposes of the project and identify the information that the project has met its goals or has advanced sufficiently to deserve continuation. The leadership of the consortium must be careful to avoid forcing premature evaluation, which is frequently the case, thus requiring project directors to spend more energy on accumulating data that supports their effort rather than conducting the best program possible with the funds and resources that have been provided.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Acres, Henry A. "Consortia and Fiscal Efficiency", LIBERAL EDUCATION. Vol. 57, pp. 252-254. May 1971.
- Campbell, Jack M. "Federation Promotes Educational Change", COMPACT. Vol. 4, pp. 15-17. April 1970.
- Frampton, David. "Developing Colleges Through Interinstitutional Cooperation", EDUCATIONAL RECORD. Vol. 48, pp. 348-354. Fall 1967.
- Grose, Robert F. "Inter-Institutional Programs - Some Examples". COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY. Vol. 46, pp. 470-479. Summer 1971.
- Grupe, Fritz H. "Founding Consortia: Idea and Reality", JOURNAL OF HIGHER EDUCATION. Vol. 42, pp. 747-762. December 1971.
- Harrison, Lowell H. "Cooperation is the Key in Kentucky", COLLEGE MANAGEMENT. vol. 5, pp. 20-21. December 1970.
- Hazdra, James J. "Argonne-Associated Colleges Cooperative Program", JOURNAL OF CHEMICAL EDUCATION. Vol. 44, pp. 403-404, Number 7. July 1967.
- Johnson, Eldon L. "New Collegiate Options Through Joint Action", LIBERAL EDUCATION. Vol. 54, pp. 80-87. March 1968.
- _____. "Consortia in Higher Education", EDUCATIONAL RECORD. Vol. 48, pp. 341-347. Fall 1967.
- Keeton, Morris. "Regional Cooperation in Higher Education", LIBERAL EDUCATION. Vol 54, pp. 1071-1073. December 1968.
- Kroepsch, Robert H. "Regional Cooperation in Higher Education", COMPACT. Vol. 4, pp 35-38. April 1970.
- McCartan, Edward F. "EDUCOM and the Applications of Technology", AUDIOVISUAL INSTRUCTION. Vol. 13, pp. 30-40. March 1968.
- McCoy, Pressley C. "The Forms of Interinstitutional Cooperation", LIBERAL EDUCATION. Vol. 54, pp.30-40. March 1968.
- Paltridge, James Gilbert. "Urban Higher Education Consortia", THE CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION. pp. 1-71. University of California, Berkeley, 1971.
- Patterson, Lewis D. "The Potential of Consortia", COMPACT. pp. 19-22. October 1971.
- Salwak, Stanley F. "New Patterns of Institutional Cooperation Compacts and Consortia", JOURNAL OF HIGHER EDUCATION. Vol. 39, pp. 490-496. December 1968.

Schwenkmeyer, Barry and Goodman, Mary Ellen (ed.). "Putting Cooperation to Work", MANAGEMENT DIVISION. Academy for Educational Development, Inc. pp. 1-20. April 1972.

"Telephone Network Provides Links for 18 Colleges to Share Academic Expertise", COLLEGE MANAGEMENT. Vol. 6, p.22. March 1971.

Thomas, Charles (Presentation). "WICHE: A Progress Report Records and Registration", COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY. Vol. 46, pp. 635-654. Summer 1971.

Wells, Herman B. "A Case Study of Interinstitutional Cooperation", EDUCATIONAL RECORD. Vol. 48, pp. 355-362. Fall 1967.

West, Elmer D. "Operational Problems that Arise Between Cooperating Institutions", LIBERAL EDUCATION. Vol 54, pp.73-79. March 1965.

Wood, Herbert H. "Cooperation Among Institutions", LIBERAL EDUCATION. Vol. 57, pp. 242-251. May 1971.

ADVANTAGES OF CONSORTIA

A. Peer Intervention:

Peer Intervention provides for institutions to share in each others planning and program development. The tendency to maintain good programs when other institutions are sharing the responsibility for planning and implementation increases the permanence of development.

B. Shared Resources:

The combined resources of several institutions may provide a more economical utilization of resources and an expansion of the potential of any given school's program. Sharing of faculty, sharing of settings, sharing of facilities are but a few of the possibilities.

C. Shared Program:

Institutions that provide unique experiences for their students could share those experiences with students from allied institutions.

D. Innovation:

The ingenuity of any given faculty member should be spread among as many other faculty as possible. To share in discussions about the improvement of educational programs by engaging faculty from several institutions will probably increase the level innovative thought for all institutions.

E. Reduction of Resistance to Change:

When individuals from several institutions convene to change teacher education they are less likely to resist ideas than they are by remaining within a single institution.

F. Cost Effectiveness:

It is not possible for most institutions to create new facilities and hire new faculty to implement new ideas or to conduct extensive research. If any given institution can capitalize on the expertise and facilities of other given institutions, expense to each can be reduced and the quality can be improved.

G. Retention of Institutional Identity:

Many institutions possess great pride in their characteristics and remain relatively constant, even though they wish to keep abreast of new developments. By forming consortia, an institution does not need to engage in the major overhaul of its characteristics to try innovation. They can either share in the effort without reaching a point of no return or they can examine the success or failure of a program before installing it themselves. The risks of change are reduced when they are spread among a variety of schools.

H. Diversity within a Consortium:

Several institutions can each be doing different things while reaping the benefits of the opinion and judgment of other institutions. Thus the benefits of a cooperative are available but the integrity and identity of individual institutions can be protected.

SECTION II

STUDENT TEACHING EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

Summary by: James M. Mahan, Director
Office of Field Experience
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

The following consortium members contributed to Section II of this report:

Bob Richardson (University of Northern Colorado), Helen Richards (Grambling University), Bill Fullerton (Arizona State University), Ross Korsgaard (University of Wisconsin at River Falls) and Jim Mahan (Indiana University).

Subcommittee Number One

1. Papers have been received from the following educators:

a. Donald E. Orlosky - "Consortia in Higher Education"

The paper includes a brief history of interinstitutional cooperating and then focuses upon logical characteristics of effective consortia. The author cites: (a) a rationale for the establishment of a specific consortium. (b) institutional self-appraisal followed by the construction of cooperative relationships, (c) determination of specific consortium purposes and objectives, (d) construction of a supportive consortium administrative structure, (e) provision of adequate fiscal support and acceptable budgetary procedures, (f) consortium evaluation plans as major topics meriting the careful attention of consortia creators. Dr. Orlosky's paper is relevant to the development of student teacher exchange programs.

b. Robert Richardson - "The University of Northern Colorado Out-of-State Field Experience Program"

This paper highlights the rapid growth in the number of out-of-state placements made and 'guest' placements received by the University of Northern Colorado between 1969-70 (11 out, 6 guests in) and 1974-75 (103 out, 32 guests in). Students in this program are permitted to teach out-of-state if: (a) the student's spouse must leave Colorado for some reason, (b) the student wishes a field experience in a very different and challenging setting, (c) the student has a job placement possibility in another state. All tuition and credit transactions remain with UNC. The out-of-state host institution places, visits, and evaluates the student as per UNC procedures. Working arrangements and fiscal provisions have followed three paths: (a) a few colleges exchange student teachers with UNC without the payment of any money to any educator, (b) some colleges cooperate with UNC on a "courtesy" basis but the home institution does provide a stipend to the public school supervising teacher, (c) other institutions cooperating with UNC work on the

agreement that the "guest" student and/or his home institution pay both a college supervisor fee and the classroom teacher honorarium. Thus there are times when out-of-state student teaching costs the preservice teacher extra money.

Evaluation of the program has been conducted via a three page questionnaire completed by the participating student teacher at the end of the field experience.

c. Robert Richardson - "Position Paper: Interinstitutional Cooperation in Teacher Education"

In this paper, Dr. Richardson reviews the Orlosky paper and encourages the Consortia Commission members not to: (a) limit the survey of consortium-type efforts to preconceived or officially baptized structures (like education centers, inter-state councils, et cetera), (b) demand that every "true" consortium have an initial and fully developed purpose and rationale, (c) dismiss lightly the impeding power of interinstitutional differences and rules, but rather to spend some time discussing solutions to these blockades, (d) over organize and structure any consortium, (e) underestimate the strength of informal, timely, common-interest based, flexible cooperation, (f) expect a consortium effort to save money for your institution, (g) eschew standard forms and testimonials as the basis for evaluation of cooperative exchange programs.

d. Ross Korsgaard - "The University of Wisconsin-River Falls Overseas Practice Teaching Program"

This paper describes how Wisconsin student teachers or student teachers from other states can be placed and supervised in Australia, England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales by UW-RF. All students register and pay tuition/fees on their home campus. Home campus officials then transfer \$110 per participating student (approximately the "hard money" spent by most colleges/universities to place and supervise a student teacher) to UW-RF. Some institutions require the student to pay all or a part of this \$110. Of the \$110, \$60 is set aside for periodic overseas site visits by a supervisor from the home campus. Participants pay an additional \$25 registration fee.

Objectives for overseas practice teaching are much the same as for in-state practice teaching but are augmented by cross-cultural, comparative education, and tolerance development thrusts. The paper states that "this program represents a loose type of consortium arrangement by which a great number of people, both here and overseas, have a valid yet relatively inexpensive overseas experience." It should be noted that many participating institutions require a United States school placement (4 or more weeks) either before or after the overseas placement.

- e. Bill Fullerton and Weston Brook - Series of papers regarding
"Placement of Student Teachers
from Other Universities"

One paper emphasizes the interest out-of-state student teachers have in obtaining placements in schools serving large numbers of Native Americans. The fee structure for ASU placement and supervision of out-of-state students is detailed. Another paper indicates that ASU students also are able to obtain non-Arizona placement in alternative schools. In such cases, "the student teacher must pay all the expenses incurred".

A third paper describes the "Oxford Semester Program" - an opportunity for 24 students per year to enroll in 8 weeks of courses and 8 weeks of student teaching (18 total semester hours) in and near Oxford, England. An ASU professor accompanies the participants and serves as visiting professor to Oxford.

A fourth paper explains the ASU Teacher Corps Project designed to prepare new teachers to more adequately meet the needs of society's alienated youth. The project staff is developing a specialization in Correctional Education. Enrollees are placed in departments of correction and community treatment centers as well as with public schools and universities.

- f. Helen L. Richards - "Grambling's Interdisciplinary Approach
to Professional Laboratory Experiences"

A portion of this paper describes a small scale, on-going student teacher exchange relationship between Grambling and the University of Wisconsin at Whitewater. Two "exchanges" from each campus were involved in 1974-75. No extra institutional expenses were incurred. The students exchanged dormitory rooms. Standard evaluation forms were used. The Grambling student teacher supervisor made a site visit in Wisconsin.

The paper also indicates that three additional Grambling preservice teachers joined nine students from four other southern institutions to accept intern placements in the Lake Washington District schools of Kirkland, Washington. The cross cultural advantages of these out-of-state placements are emphasized in the paper.

- g. James Mahan - "Collaborative Arrangements for the Out-of-State Placement
of Student Teachers in Cross Cultural Settings: Actual
Conditions/Desired Conditions"

Indiana University's out-of-state Latin and American Indian student teaching projects serving approximately 60 students per year are described. Selected, important project components are identified and actual conditions are desired conditions relevant to those components exposed.

Explicit purposes for the projects and associated collaboration, participant recruitment and selection, cross-cultural preparation

of enrollees, evaluation of project performance of participants, post-project employment success of graduates, modification of conventional university/state rules are viewed as above average (quite satisfactory) components.

Contractual agreements with schools/agencies, external supervision of student teachers, critic teacher supervision of student teachers, fiscal support for the projects, are viewed as average ("tolerably" satisfactory) components. Interinstitutional differences in student teaching procedures are rated as a below average (less than satisfactory) component of the cross-cultural placement projects.

The paper concludes with a proposal that a few interested institutions unite to construct a multi-culturally oriented student teacher interchange consortium encompassing many of the characteristics mentioned in the Orlosky paper.

- h. Tom Stebbins and Katy Maddox - "Kanawha Valley Multi-Institutional Teacher Education Center (MITEC) Enrichment Modules" Charleston, West Virginia

MITEC offers student teachers and interns from its six participating colleges and universities a choice of 16 distinctive enrichment experiences in addition to student teaching. These enrichment modules from four weeks up to a full semester are in a variety of local, state and international settings. MITEC has contract agreements with McGill University, Montreal, Canada; Hampton Institute, Virginia; Gladstone School, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; University of Mexico for a multi-cultural enrichment through cooperative arrangements with the University of Alabama; and St. Lawrence University, New York for an experience in working with children of Indian culture. In addition to MITEC's sending student teachers to the above named options, MITEC also accepts student teachers from any of the named institutions, as well as occasional guests from other colleges and universities throughout the country. There are no additional fees charged for the exchange student teaching program.

1. Ronnie Stanford (Alabama University, Tuscaloosa) - telephone conversation

Ronnie Stanford reports that Alabama University accepts and places a few student teachers from out-of-state institutions for personal reasons of the applicant and on a "courtesy" basis. In addition, Alabama University operates an International program in Student Teaching (major emphasis on Latin America). Auburn University, Kentucky University and other institutions channel their interested students to Alabama University where they register for student teaching in foreign sites. A consortium has been developed to publicize and operate this foreign student teaching effort. Tuition is paid to Alabama University.

2. Consortia Research

Mr. Jess Rose - doctoral student in curriculum and instruction at the University of Northern Colorado completed a survey of the literature and made a report to the commission on February 19, 1976.

His final report has been submitted to the executive committee of ATE as a part of the final report by the Commission on Consortium Study and Development.

Comments on Student Teacher Exchange Projects

Examination of the papers submitted by Subcommittee Number One members and informal conversations with other teacher educators tend to push one toward these conclusions:

- a. There are relatively few true student teacher exchange (or interchange) projects in existence in the nation. The word "exchange" seemingly implies that institution A receives, places and supervises student teachers from institution W while institution W, in turn, receives, places and supervises student teachers from institution A.
- b. There are several out-of-state, collaborative student teacher placements projects. For example, institution A receives aid from institution W in placing and supervising A's students in a unique field setting in geographical proximity to institution W. However, institution W sends no student teachers to institution A. Another example involves institution A placing and supervising students from institutions K, L, and M in national site R or foreign site T.
- d. The most frequent reason for out-of-state student teaching placements is the personal desires/constraints of individual student teachers. Less common are projects designed to accomplish a major instructional purpose, incorporate thorough evaluation, include special preparatory training, et cetera.
- e. When an out-of-state or exchange project is constructed with a central instructional purpose, multi-cultural and cross-cultural experiences are the most frequent goals of that project. There is some evidence to indicate that alternative school experiences and exposure to the philosophy/methods of educators in alternative schools will undergird many out-of-state placements in the future.
- f. Out-of-state and exchange projects tend to be supported on a "hard money" basis with students often being asked to cover all or part of any extra expenses. Exchange projects seem to result in less need for extra money than do out-of-state projects. External supervision in out-of-state and exchange projects appears to meet, but not exceed, the minimum number of visits required by state or university certification commissions.

- g. There is a growing interest on the part of the student teachers in out-of-state or campus-distant field placements.
- h. Out-of-state and exchange projects of all kinds probably have resulted in the modification or softening of many state education department, school of education, and public school rules and fiscal procedures. This means that there are valuable precedents to use in organizing more comprehensive consortia for the exchange of student teachers.
- i. Many collaborative placement arrangements have been made over the telephone or in the corridors at the national ATE conference between two or more teacher educators who already were supportive friends. Sophisticated consortia can not be built under these conditions. Teacher educators merit development time to develop examinable, cooperative programs that can be evaluated.
- j. Literature and conversations reveal little preliminary preparation of students who are being "exported" to distant and unique sites. Assumptions are apparently made that an institution's methods courses and general education course prerequisites adequately prepare preservice teachers for all ethnic settings, all types of school organizations, all types of innovative curricula, et cetera. Is this a safe assumption?

A Rough Framework for
Examining Student Teacher
Exchange Efforts

On a basis of incomplete data gleaned or inferred from subcommittee papers and additional telephone conversations, selected student teacher exchange efforts have been classified in the following table. It is initially admitted that the author's understanding of the projects is imperfect and certain classifications may be erroneous. However, this crude attempt to classify "exchanges" may motivate us all to build a sophisticated, practical, widely useful categorization scheme for analyzing on-going projects and constructing future projects. Obviously several more columns could be added to the table - nature of supervision, extent of evaluation, et cetera.

TABLE I APPROACHES TO THE EXCHANGE OR EXPORTATION OF STUDENT TEACHERS

	Type of Project in Happy Hour Language	Target of Placement	Magnitude of Effort	Common Purpose Behind Effort	Possible Examples Drawn from Reports/Conversations
A. X	Yeah - I'll be glad to place & supervise a couple student teachers for you.	In-state and out-of-state	An occasional student	Solve a student's personal problem	Dozens of institutions i.e., Alabama, I.U., Indiana State, also often done by regional campuses within the same state
B. *	You informally take care of a couple of mine - and I'll informally take a couple of yours.	In-state and out-of-state	Very small number of students	Solve student personal problems or provide a unique placement	Many institutions
C. **	Let's work out the reciprocal placement of some student teachers on a formal fiscal and supervisory basis.	In-state and out-of-state	Larger number of students - perhaps 10-100	Solve student personal problems or provide a unique placement desired by student	Univ. of North Colorado project; Univ. of West Virginia with McGill and Hampton Institute, Grambling with Wisconsin.
D. X	My institution will help you find sites, place students, and find supervisors for your project.	Out-of-state most commonly	Larger numbers of students - perhaps 10-50	Make special struc- tured, ethnic cross- cultural or alter- native school experi- ences possible.	Arizona State, Arizona Univ., North Arizona, Northeastern Illinois have aided I.U. in conducting Indian and Latino projects.
E. X	Will you accept a couple of our stu- dents into your institution's special project on your terms if tuition is paid to you?	In-state and out-of-state	An occasional student	Permit a student to participate in all the features of a comprehensive project	Central Michigan accepts out- siders into its overseas pro- ject. Institutions have sent students to I.U.'s projects. Alabama University accepts outsiders into its Latin American project.
F. X	I've arranged directly with a distant school system to obtain place- ments and supervisory personnel (no other university involved)	In-state and out-of-state	Commonly used effort and can involve many student teachers	Cross-cultural ethnic, and alternative experiences	Some parts of the I.U. pro- jects. One of the Grambling projects

G.	We have a foreign-based project in which students and faculty institutions can participate and still register on the home campus	Out-of-country	Larger numbers of students	Cross-cultural comparative education goals	University of Wisconsin-River Falls overseas program
X					
H.	We sponsor unique project A; you sponsor unique project Z.	Out-of-state and in-state could be out-of-country	Apparently few such projects and few students	Permit student access to comprehensive, structured, and oriented projects	Not aware of an example
***	Let's interchange a negotiated number of students, prepare, place, and supervise them within the two projects.				
I.	Just enroll our student at your school	In-state and occasionally out-of-state	An occasional student	University convenience and solution of student's personal problems	Many institutions when time and trouble must be minimized.
X	and we'll accept his/her student teaching credit.				
J.	We have a state-based project in which students and faculty from other institutions can participate and still register on the <u>home</u> campus.	In-state	Small numbers of students	Intensive supervision or comprehensive project	Network of seven statewide Teacher Education Centers in West Virginia
X					
K.	We can place your students through our institution as per a set fee schedule.	Out-of-state, usually	Small numbers of students	Fulfill intense personal desire of individual students	Arizona State University, out-of-state placement package.
X					

- KEY *
- An alternative that rarely involves true interchange of student A in institution A for student B in institution B and vice versa.
- **
- An alternative that sometimes (but not regularly) involves true interchange of students.
- ***
- An alternative that is completely predicated on true interchange of student teachers.
- X
- An alternative that seems to have no true interchange of students.

SECTION III

TEACHER EDUCATION CONSORTIUM MODELS

Summary by: Kathryn H. Maddox, Director
Kanawha Valley Multi-Institutional
Teacher Education Center (MITEC)
Charleston, West Virginia

Subcommittee Tasks: The subcommittee composed of Joy Babb, Bob Stevenson, Floyd Perry, Duaine Kingery and Kathryn Maddox was charged with writing a three to four page description of the particular type of teacher education center or consortium with which they are personally involved. Summaries of the papers have been prepared and are presented below. The subcommittee was also charged with exploring statewide movements in establishing consortiums. Only two states, Wisconsin and West Virginia, responded to this challenge. Summaries of these two state movements are also included in this summary report.

1. Summaries of Teacher Education Centers and/or Consortiums:

a. Kathryn Maddox - "Kanawha Valley Multi-Institutional Teacher Education Center (MITEC)"

The Best of Two Worlds - The public school and higher education are brought together through the Kanawha Valley Teacher Education Center. The main purpose of the Center is to improve the quality of pre- and continuing education, to improve teachers' instructional effectiveness and consequently to improve the educational opportunities for boys and girls.

MITEC, in operation since 1966, includes both pre-service and continuing education. The governing body of the Center hires a director and sets the policies and bylaws by which the consortium functions. By pooling the talents and resources of the colleges, school systems, state department, professional organizations, and the educational community a quality teacher education program results. The principle of parity is achieved through cooperative governments and through cooperative funding from each of the consortium members.

Through MITEC approximately 64 different staff development courses are offered each year for teachers in the four counties of Region III RESA. A needs assessment determines the course offerings and consultants are selected from the participating colleges, the community, state department and from nationally known educators. Teachers receive a team inservice credit hours (with pay) and in some cases graduate credit as well.

Another distinctive feature is the emerging new roles which have resulted through the Center concept. One such role, that of school-based teacher education coordinator, is making a decisive impact on both pre-service and inservice programs within the school site centers.

b. Joy Babb - "Dallas Teacher Education Center, Dallas, Texas"

The Dallas Center, funded by Texas Senate Bill VIII, ESAA, Title I and local funds has set out to prove that a large urban public school system, area colleges and universities, an education service center, professional organizations and community can work with state and national agencies to prepare educational personnel to meet urban problems more effectively. DTEC is governed by a 45 member council which governs the Center within bylaws established by the consortium.

Objectives of the Dallas Center include:

- (1) To develop competency-based pre-service and inservice teacher education programs with an urban orientation.
- (2) To provide comprehensive inservice personnel development programs for district employees.
- (3) To conduct product research and development.
- (4) To test (in a laboratory) strategies and proven modes of teaching.
- (5) To disseminate programs which have been developed by/or adapted to the district.

c. Bob Stevenson - "University of Maryland Teacher Education Centers"

The Teacher Education Centers grew from the mutual desire on the part of the University and the area public schools to bring about a more effective program of teacher education integrating both theory and practice. The program brings together the pre-service and inservice components in an attempt to offer a unified and continuous program of teacher education. Governance is provided by a joint council with public school and university representatives.

At each school site, a Center coordinator is jointly hired by the University and the school system. In each of the cases this person has been with a public school background. The role of the University supervisor becomes more of a consultant to the teaching staff of the school center. The University assumes greater responsibility in inservice education.

The student teachers, rather than being assigned to a specific teacher, are assigned to the Center. This provides a more varied, flexible and individualized experience. In turn, the Center staff assumes a greater responsibility for planning and providing a developmental series of experiences for student teachers.

- d. Floyd Perry - "Central Minnesota Teacher Education Council (CMTEC)"

CMTEC is a non-profit tax exempt corporation. Its total membership of 38 is composed of 33 public school teachers and administrators and five members from St. Cloud State College. The Council involves 15 public school districts with the college for the purpose of promoting the improvement of teacher education with emphasis upon student teaching, internship and research.

Special legislation was passed in Minnesota to make it legal for school districts to join CMTEC. Financial support is primarily from membership dues of the \$25 paid by the school district for each student teacher. Inservice programs are sponsored for supervising teachers, administrators, student teachers, and college supervisors.

- e. Helen Richards - "Grambling Interdisciplinary Approach, Grambling, Louisiana"

Rather than a teacher center concept, Grambling's program focuses on a strong interdisciplinary approach to teacher education. Student teachers and interns spend a full semester in either a laboratory school or in a public school. The faculty from all disciplines work closely in cross-disciplined teams to plan, teach and supervise the student teachers and interns throughout their educational preparation.

The students have the full support of college supervisors and local school personnel in cooperation with their supervising teachers. Students engage in team teaching, individualized instruction, small group instruction and total class instruction. Conferences and self-evaluation are engaged in for every teaching-learning activity.

- f. Sylvia Mygoda and Charles Franzen - "Atlanta Area Teacher Education Service (AATES), Atlanta, Georgia"

The AATES evolved from the belief that continuing education needs of teachers could best be solved through a mutually beneficial consortium. Differentiating AATES from most other consortium efforts is its thrust toward diversified activities rather than offering only courses and workshops.

AATES has been instrumental in planning and implementing changes at both the school system, such as implementing the twelve-month school program, as well as at the college level. Another service of AATES is to sponsor clinics on national levels such as the national conference on teacher centers and another on competency-based education. The most recent collaborative effort has been the establishment of a committee to organize and implement teacher education centers in the Atlanta area.

Several other services coordinated by AATES include:

- (1) Providing a master file of resource persons available to local educators.
- (2) Holding meetings among educators representing various subject fields for better understanding of elementary and secondary teacher education.
- (3) Holding one-day institutes to help school administrators keep abreast of current education practices.
- (4) Securing national consultants and assisting with research when requested.

2. Summaries of Statwide Teacher Education Models

a. Kathryn Maddox and Zeb Wright - "West Virginia Statewide Plan"

Since 1963, West Virginia has had enabling legislation passed for school systems and colleges to engage in collaborative teacher education programs. West Virginia is now divided into eight geographical areas of the state called Regional Education Service Agencies (RESA). Seven teacher centers are funded by the legislature and are now operable. Each of the 21 colleges and universities in the state is a member of one or more teacher centers. Although each center operates under a unique governance structure, all centers constitute a consortium consisting of the participating counties, the cooperating colleges and universities, the State Department of Education, the West Virginia Education Association, and other agencies.

These centers are designed to provide opportunities for institutions of higher education and county boards of education to cooperate in such phases of teacher preparation as student teaching, clinical instruction, continuing education, and many varied and creative approaches that show promise of improving the training of teachers. Two prominent features of this consortia approach are readily apparent: (1) colleges and universities have had to willingly give up some of their traditional autonomy as they come together in a center, (2) the State Department of Education is a full partner in this collaborative venture.

Each year the seven statewide centers must submit a proposal to the State Department to apply for continued funding. The State Department establishes guidelines for the proposal including specific behavioral objectives for the coming year, long-range objectives, pre- and inservice program plans, financial needs, research and evaluation plans. A second part of the proposal consists of an accounting of the previous year's program, accomplishments and budget.

The projected budget submitted with the center's proposal includes anticipated financial contribution of member institutions, and estimates of sources and amounts of other income. The proposal review committee will take into consideration the extent to which the consortium members, themselves, are contributing to the financial support of the center, and the reported services each provided for the consortium members.

Centers within West Virginia are encouraged to share resources. This is especially advisable in the case of out-of-state consultants, evaluation, and the purchase and sharing of training/protocol materials.

The ultimate test of the effectiveness of consortia is product evaluation. Since a basic assumption of centers is a consortium arrangement, in situ, is a better pattern than prior efforts, the evaluation program of each center should be concerned with comparative data of the products of centers contrasted with traditional programs. General staff and governing boards are ever alert in designing sound research for which adequate resources of staff and budget are available.

b. Ross Korsgaard - "Wisconsin Improvement Program: A Consortium for Teacher Education"

In 1959 the Wisconsin Improvement Program - as initiated to improve classroom instruction and teacher preparation. Today, the Wisconsin Improvement Program has grown to become a consortium of 16 Wisconsin colleges and universities which, with approval of appropriate State Departments, public instruction, places about 1,000 interns each year in the public schools of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Illinois and Iowa.

The intern is salaried, licensed, and assigned to an approved school system for one semester. Within the design one or more interns work as a part of the team under supervision of one or more experienced teacher.

The beauty of this design is that the financial structure allows the local school system \$150 for each intern for local inservice programs and \$150 for the Wisconsin Improvement Program office for general inservice activities. The intern receives a salary of \$1,500 per semester.

The next step in the WIP's development is a post-graduate residency program for all first year teachers in Wisconsin as a part of their professional growth. Teachers would be assigned on a team basis for a 50-80 percent teaching load.

Since implementation three years ago, over 300 general inservice projects have been approved by the Wisconsin Improvement Program from the funds school districts sent to that office. The local inservice component is retained by the school district for unit school inservice development. Its use is determined creatively and uniquely by the principal and team members of

the unit school. These components have been used to support such things as conference attendance, purchase of materials, orientation activities and semester transition coordination.

3. Topics for Early Consideration in Establishing a Teacher Education Consortium

The following is a minimum list of topics that require careful consideration very early in the development of cooperative centers. There are many more. It is crucial at the outset to help the people involved to think together, to get on the same wave length, in essence to develop a communality of goal setting. While seemingly time consuming it is the most productive over the long run.

- a. Is the program to be considered as pre-service or inservice or a combination of both?
- b. A general statement of agreement, along the lines of "Why do we want to do this?", is helpful. This may indicate some of the benefits to be derived.
- c. A clear statement on governance should be worked out. For example, if a council is to be used, should it be policy making or only advisory?
- d. Role definitions need to be clearly spelled out in early discussions. What is expected from the coordinator, the classroom teacher, the principal, the student teacher and the university supervisor or consultant?
- e. Financial agreements should be worked out well in advance. Submission of university budgets is often required much earlier than school system budgets. An effort needs to be made to get the two on line as soon as possible.
- f. Budget formation is of course a reflection of a variety of agreements. Who supplies what and how much? How much money should be allotted for travel, consultants, and conferences? How much for materials ranging from office supplies to video tape?
- g. Decisions on employment practices need to be made. Is a joint appointment salary evenly divided between the public school and the university? Which salary scale should be followed? What vacation schedule? What are the position requirements in terms of experience and degrees? Universities and public schools sometimes differ in outlook in these areas.
- h. How can recognition for program participants be provided and what form should it take? For example in some arrangements, what the teachers want most is the hardest to get - released time.

1. What cooperating agencies should be involved? What role will they play?
- j. Evaluation sometimes makes people uneasy when it comes up. It's helpful to look at the process early. What and who will be evaluated? What criteria will be used? Who will do the evaluation?